

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
(Attorney Docket No. 02-957)

In re Application of: )  
Rajamohana Hegde )  
Serial No.: 10/603,388 ) Group Art Unit: 2611  
Filed: June 24, 2003 ) Examiner: Juan A. Torres  
For: Method and Apparatus for Delayed ) Confirmation No. 3034  
Recursion Decoder )

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Sir:

Responsive to the Notice of Allowance mailed December 7, 2006, the Applicants express appreciation for the allowance of the present application. Applicants understand that the Examiner has thoroughly examined the claims and prior art of record and has concluded that the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest the combinations of steps and/or structure recited by each of the allowed claims.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Office's Statement of Reasons for Allowance are only warranted in instances in which the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims. In light of the original disclosure, previous Office Actions, and Responses to the Office Actions, however, the Applicants believe that the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear.

Although the Office expressly recited a combination of the elements of independent claims 1 and 9 as a reason for allowance, the Applicants understand that the Office has thoroughly analyzed and examined all of the allowed claims in view of the prior art of record and has concluded that each individual claim recites patentable subject matter.

Further, the Applicants do not agree with each statement in the Office's Statement of Reasons for Allowance because it might be taken to suggest that patentability was determined on the basis of a combination of elements from more than one of the claims. While the Applicants believe that the claims are allowable, the Applicants submit that patentability resides in the combination of elements as set forth in the individual claims. Thus, Applicants do not acquiesce to any suggestion that the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance changes the language set forth in any of the claims, or the scope of the properly interpreted claims.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: March 7, 2007

By: /Robert J. Irvine III/  
Robert J. Irvine III  
Reg. No. 41,865